REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed April 29, 2004 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claim 2 is canceled. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 8 have been amended. Claim 17 is added. Claims 1 and 3-17 are pending in this application, with claim 1 being the only independent claim. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action mailed April 29, 2004, claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-11, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,403,712 (Wiesinger).

Claims 3, 6, and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Wiesinger in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,547,575 (Kato).

Before discussing the cited prior art and the Examiner's rejections of the claims in view of that art, a brief summary of the present invention is appropriate. The present invention relates to an electronic apparatus having two parts connected by a hinge. According to the present invention, a first part 10 is connected to a second part 20 by an elastic sheet 30 (see page 6, lines 2-4 of the present specification). The parts 10, 20 are pivotable from a closed position shown in Fig. 1 to an open position shown in Fig. 2. In the closed position, the elastic sheet 30 is folded along a line 38 transverse to the longitudinal axis of the sheet which extends between first and second ends 32, 34 of the elastic sheet (page 6, lines 18-20). The elastic sheet 30 is loaded in the closed position and urges the first and second parts 10, 20 toward the open position (page 6, line 20 to page 7, line 1). The sheet 30 is attached to the first and second parts 10, 20 with a transverse curve for increasing stability in the open position (page 6, lines 16-17).

A flexible circuit board 42 and/or an RF cable 44 extend along the length of the elastic sheet 30 between the first and second parts 10, 20 (page 7, lines 12-14; Fig. 5). An elastomeric sheath 40 may enclose the elastic sheet 30 and connectors 42, 44 (page 7, lines 12-14).

Independent claim 1 is amended to clarify that the two parts connected by the elastic sheet are part of an electronic apparatus. Independent claim 1 is further amended to define the closed and open positions of the two parts and to clarify that the open position corresponds to the unloaded position of the elastic sheet and to recite wherein a transverse section of said elastic sheet proximate at least one of said first and second ends of said elastic sheet is curved for stabilizing said longitudinally unloaded position, wherein a center of curvature of said transverse section of said elastic sheet is approximately normal to said longitudinal axis. Support for this limitation is found in Fig. 5 which shows the curve and page 6, lines 16-17, which describes the curve.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (see MPEP §2131). It is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Wiesinger because Wiesinger fails to disclose a hinge having an elastic sheet for connecting the two parts as expressly recited in independent claim 1. In contrast, Figs. 1-3 of Wiesinger disclose a hinge having two connecting elements 5 being approximately U-shaped in cross section and tapering in the direction of the axis 4 (see col. 4, lines 26-31 of Wiesinger). The Office Action states that the hinge section 5 discloses the claims elastic sheet. However, the elements 5 are specifically formed with a tapered U-shape in both the closed and open position (see Figs. 1 and 2). It is respectfully submitted that tapered, U-shaped elements can not be considered to be a sheet. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Wiesinger fails to disclose "an elastic sheet having a first end fixed to said first

part, a second end fixed to said second part, and a longitudinal axis extending from said first end to said second end, said elastic sheet being foldable transversely of said longitudinal axis so that said first part is pivotable with respect to said second part".

Furthermore, Wiesinger fails to disclose that "wherein a transverse section of said elastic sheet proximate at least one of said first and second ends of said elastic sheet is curved for stabilizing said longitudinally unloaded position, wherein a center of curvature of said transverse section of said elastic sheet is approximately normal to said longitudinal axis". Wiesinger fails to disclose a curvature at the end of an elastic sheet for stabilizing the unloaded position of the elastic sheet. The hinge of Wiesinger is curved only to match the edge of the circular lid and body. This curvature of Wiesinger has a center of curvature that is along the longitudinal axis of the hinge and fails to stabilize the longitudinally unloaded position.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Wiesinger under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Kato fails to teach or suggest what Wiesinger lacks. Kato discloses a hinged connection between a display part and a base part of a laptop or notebook computer. Kato fails to disclose that the hinge 27 is resilient. Kato specifically teaches a connection for signal connections between the computer base and the display part of the computer. The Examiner states that Kato has a resilient hinge. However, Kato discloses that one side of the conductive member 93 is connected to the display part and the other side of the conductive member is connected to the base part of the computer. The section of the conductive member between the two parts bends when the parts are moved relative to each other. However, there is no indication that conductive member 93 is resilient. Furthermore, Kato discloses further hinge members 29, 31, 33, 35 which guide the pivotal movement of the two parts. None of the hinge members of

Kato comprises a part that loads the first part toward an open position. Accordingly, Kato fails to teach or suggest that that the hinge includes "an elastic sheet having a first end fixed to said first part, a second end fixed to said second part, and a longitudinal axis extending from said first end to said second end, said elastic sheet being foldable transversely of said longitudinal axis so that said first part is pivotable with respect to said second part" and "said elastic sheet, when folded transversely of said centerline, loading said first part away from said second part toward a longitudinally unloaded position of said sheet".

Dependent claims 2-18, being dependent on independent claim 1, are deemed allowable for the same reasons expressed above with respect to independent claim 1.

Dependent claim 5 recites that "when said sheet is in said longitudinally unloaded position, said sheet is curved transversely of said axis from said first end to said second end". Such as transverse curve is shown in Fig. 5. Neither Wiesinger nor Kato discloses this limitation. The curve disclosed by Wiesinger does not extend between the two ends of the hinge. Kato fails to disclose the claimed curve.

Dependent claim 8 recites that "said first and second ends being fixed in respective said first and second parts with said central planes at respective first and second angles to said centerline, said angles being determinative of the angle between the central planes when said sheet is in said longitudinally unloaded position". This limitation is disclosed in Fig. 4. It is respectfully submitted that neither Wiesinger nor Kato disclose this limitation.

Dependent claim 17 recites "wherein said elastic sheet and said flexible printed circuit element form a laminate, said electronic apparatus further comprising an elastomeric sheath on said laminate". This limitation is shown in Fig. 5. Wiesinger fails to disclose a flexible printed circuit element. Furthermore, the conductors of Kato do not form a laminate with an

elastic sheet. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claim 17 is also allowable over Wiesinger and Kato.

The application is now deemed to be in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By _____

Alfred W. Froebrich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: October 29, 2004